DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 802 PS 026 481

AUTHOR LeBlanc, H. Paul, III; French, Kathryn J.
TITLE Rule Making Authority: Negotiation at Home and in the Classroom.
PUB DATE 1997-04-04
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association (68th, San Antonio, TX, April 4, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; College Students; Context Effect; *Family Environment; Family Relationship; Family (Sociological Unit); Higher Education; Role Conflict; *Social Development; *Socialization; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Negotiation Processes

ABSTRACT

The socialization process results from development within cultural or social contexts. This study examined attitudes of 107 college students surveyed regarding the negotiation of rules in both the family and the classroom, which are regarded as socialization contexts. Three major concepts formed the framework for the study: first, the theoretical grounding of the socialization process; second, the nature of rules of interaction within a system and characteristics of rules which may apply to families and/or classrooms; and third, characteristics specific to family and classroom systems. The study explored when the socialization or rule structures are transformed from an imposition to a negotiation, and whether school and family contexts differ in appropriateness of age for negotiation and under which conditions negotiation should occur in these two contexts. The results indicate that living arrangements and race influence attitudes regarding rule negotiation in family and classroom contexts. Furthermore, the findings suggests that living arrangements, race, and gender influence differences in attitudes regarding cooperation with rules between the family and the classroom context, and at what age rule negotiation should occur in both contexts. (Contains 3 tables, 34 references, and the Authority for Rule Making Survey.) (JPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

ED 418 802

Running head: RULE MAKING AUTHORITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Rule-Making Authority:

Negotiation at Home and in the Classroom

H. Paul LeBlanc III
Southern Illinois University,
Carbondale

Kathryn J. French
West Frankfort,
Illinois

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. Paul LeBlanc III

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the sixty-eighth annual meeting of the
Southern States Communication Association, San Antonio, TX,
April 4, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS 026481

Abstract

Previous studies have examined the attitudes of students regarding classroom rules. As well, considerable research has examined the socialization processes in the family and educational contexts. Research demonstrates individuals become increasingly more involved in definitions of self, including the negotiation of rules and relational boundaries as a consequence of the developmental process. This study examines attitudes of students regarding the negotiation of rules in both the family and the classroom. The results indicate that living arrangements and race influence attitudes regarding rule negotiation in family and classroom contexts. Furthermore, this study suggests that living arrangements, race and gender influence differences in attitudes regarding cooperation with rules between the family and the classroom context, and at what age rule negotiation should occur in both contexts. The study concludes with recommendations and directions for future studies.

Rule Making Authority:

Negotiation at Home and in the Classroom

As part of the human condition, people must interact with one another. People interact with each other in ways that are predicted by earlier behavior. That is, individuals interact in learned patterns which are a function of socialization. And, socialization is the process by which persons learn what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior in a given cultural or social context.

In this study, the social contexts are the family system and the classroom. According to Goldenberg and Goldenberg (1991), a system is a group of interacting, interdependent individuals that together make up a whole arrangement or organization. A system (family) is organized into a fairly stable set of relationships (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1991). "A family is a natural social system, with properties all its own, one that has evolved a set of rules, is replete with assigned and ascribed roles for its members, has an organized power structure, has developed intricate overt and covert forms of communication, and has elaborate ways of negotiating and problem solving that permit various tasks to be performed effectively" (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1991). This definition can be equally applied to the classroom, although the specific characteristics of the family relationship may differ significantly from the relationships between members in a classroom. The definition of family, and classroom, as a system implies a transactional process of socialization.

To describe the transactional process of socialization within these contexts, three major concepts will be explored. First, the socialization process will be theoretically grounded. Second, the nature of rules of interaction within a system will be described; then characteristics of rules which may apply to families and/or classrooms will be discussed. Finally, family and classroom systems will be examined by their characteristics. It is important to note that family and classroom

systems interact with larger social systems, and the larger social context influences the development of families through the process of socialization.

In this study, we are interested in when the socialization of rule structures may be transformed from an imposition to a negotiation. Specifically, we are interested in examining student perceptions regarding at what age children should begin to negotiate rules with adults within the social contexts of family and classroom. We are interested in examining whether these two contexts differ in appropriateness of age for negotiation, and under which conditions negotiation should occur in these two contexts.

The process of socialization

Several theories have been posited which seek to illustrate the socialization process. The socialization process implies learning of meaning or behaviors by an individual entering a system. Social learning theory (John B. Watson, Albert Bandura, Richard Walters; theorists cited in Grusec & Lytton, 1988) suggests that individuals imitate actions as a result of conditioning and reinforcement. Social learning theory posits that conditioning and problem solving are the processes by which individuals learn. Conditioning occurs as a response to stimuli repeated until the stimuli is no longer needed to induce the desired behavior. Problem solving on the other hand, occurs as a result of dissonance and the desire to reduce it. This desire serves as a motivating factor in the cognitive search for a means to reduce cognitive dissonance (Mowrer, 1960). Social learning theory implies a connection between behaviors and meaning. Indeed, behaviors may result from attitudes (meaning) that the individual holds.

The social learning theoretical perspective would suggest that children learn what is acceptable behavior as a result of reinforcement. Reinforcement occurs through interaction. Behaviors that result in positive reinforcers, such as a smile, are strengthened. Whereas, behaviors

that result in negative reinforcers, such as a spanking, are suppressed, and those that are not reinforced are extinguished (McCoy & Zigler, 1965). However, meaning is attached to the behavior, whether reinforced, suppressed or extinguished.

On the other hand, cognitive developmental theory (Jean Piaget, James Mark Baldwin, theorists cited in Grusec & Lytton, 1988) suggests that the socialization process involves assimilation of events given existing mental structures and accommodation of new ideas for problem solving. Individuals are typically motivated to maintain equilibrium between assimilation processes and accommodation processes but may opt for one process over the other as a result of cognitive dissonance (Grusec & Lytton, 1988). For example, an individual may opt for the assimilation process to overcome cognitive dissonance when the attitudes surrounding the event are well established and are central to the individual's self-concept. Either theoretical perspective assumes that the socialization process involves interaction between an agent and a target. The theoretical perspective known as symbolic interactionism proposes that meaning is communicated through behavior between interactants (Mead, 1934; cited in Littlejohn, 1989). This interaction is communicative by nature and involves observation.

These observations of behavior, by the target, are organized into cognitive schemata, which serve as knowledge bases for achieving goals (Berger & Kellerman, in press). These knowledge bases are mental structures or rules for mentally organizing information, and therefore developing meaning, as hypothesized by Immanuel Kant (1781) in the Critique of Pure Reason (cited in Jones, 1975) and later considered as cognitive schemata by Frederick C. Bartlett (1932; cited in Smith, 1982). Meaning is therefore attached to observations as a function of already existing schemata. The individual develops methods to achieve goals based on those meanings. Goals such as being accepted into a group, or not being alienated from a group, serve as

motivators for acting appropriately. The group is defined by rules which specify actions or behaviors that are expected of its members.

In summary, the socialization of individuals into a culture or social group involves the observation by the individual of patterns of behavior idiosyncratic to the group. The individual attaches meaning to those observations. The process of attaching meaning can be influenced by the interaction between the individual and other members of the group through interaction and negotiation. The development of meaning within the individual occurs in the form of cognitive schema, which pertain to expected behaviors within the group that are formalized as rules.

Rules and rule development

Susan Shimanoff (1980) defines a rule as a prescription which can be followed and suggests behaviors that are obligated, preferred, or prohibited in particular contexts. Rules are determined by the society, the family, or a member of a group given authority to prescribe rules, such as the head of household or the teacher, and can be implicit or explicit. Implicit rules are guides which are not formally stated but rather define behavior as appropriate or inappropriate based on actions that are either performed or not performed by the group. An example of an implicit rule within a family might concern being loyal toward family members: do not talk about family problems to non-family members.

Implicit rules may have been stated explicitly at an earlier time in another social context (system) but are assumed to apply by members of a new social context. For example, a child learns rules of interaction in his or her family of origin. These rules are then applied to other contexts such as friendships, boss/subordinate relationships, or student/teacher relationships. The notions of accommodation and assimilation from cognitive developmental theory play a role in the assumption of rules implicitly from one social context to another. Conversely, explicit rules are

formally stated regulations or customs that define appropriate or inappropriate behaviors for a specific group. An example of an explicit rule in the family might be that children are expected to be at home by eleven o'clock in the evening.

> The role of rules in communicative interaction cannot be understated. Shimanoff states: "In order for communication to exist, or continue, two or more interacting individuals must share rules for using symbols. Not only must they have rules for individual symbols, but they must also agree on such matters as to how to take turns at speaking, how to be polite or how to insult, to greet, and so forth. If every symbol user manipulated symbols at random, the result would be chaos rather than communication" (p. 31-32).

Rule development begins in early childhood. A child learns rules about language through interaction. An example of one type of interaction in which infants take part is games. In a study conducted by Bruner and Sherwood (1976), observations were made regarding an infants' rule development for the game of peekaboo. The study indicated that in the game of peekaboo, the infant appears to learn not only the rules of the game, but also the range of variation possible within the set of rules. It is the emphasis upon patterned variation with the constraints of the rule set that seems crucial to the mastery of competence and generativeness.

The formation of the explicit rule (for interaction) may be a result of a behavior that is contrary to the implicit expectations of the group or system. When behavior occurs which is contrary to the goals of the group it is labeled deviant. This deviance may or may not have been intentional, or intentionally deviant. However, when deviant behavior occurs, it creates a crisis situation in which the group may decide to state the rule, therefore making the rule explicit. Implicit rules exist when members of the group know what is expected of them as a consequence

of observed behavior of other members of the group (Ford, 1983). Therefore, implicit nonverbal rules are defined as communicative rules for nonverbal interaction that are learned through a socialization process. As Staats and Staats (1958) suggested, knowledge of rules are learned through the performance and observation of verbal and nonverbal communicative behaviors.

Groups are defined by rules which indicate who belongs or does not belong to the group. Rule violation occurs when a member of a group defined by the rule acts contrary to the suggested behavior. This may require specific knowledge of the rule. If the individual group member is unaware of the rule, then the rule violation is an unintentional deviation from expected behavior. However, if a group member is aware of the rule, then a true violation occurs whether or not the individual agrees with the rule. A violation of a rule may precipitate negative sanctions by the authority setting the rule or by the group that is defined by the rule. The force of the rule defining the group is not determined by its implicit or explicit nature but rather by the meaning of the rule for the group and the sanctions incurred by its violation. These negative sanctions can include punishment, ostracism, or alienation from the group. Consistent violation of the rule may result in reformulation of the rule, or a withdrawal of the rule.

Rules, therefore, are learned and used in everyday interactions. For example, Burgoon and Saine (1978) have found that our society has evolved rules about how and when one gazes at another. Also, proximity rules dictate that closeness communicates friendliness, but too much closeness creates discomfort in others. Rules also affect how persons interact with one another. For instance, the style of expression and the skill of communication are influenced by the emotional expressiveness of the family environment (Halberstadt, 1986). "In a society where being liked is important, the child is often taught . . . to fit smoothly with all his age peers" (Bell, 1963).

Other research on rules was conducted by Brown and Levinson (1987). They suggest that interaction is based on universal rules of politeness in language, and that violation can incur sanctions. These rules of politeness are based on individuals' desires to save or maintain "face." The researchers distinguish rule types by function: rules of positive politeness such as cooperation thus saving face, and rules of negative politeness such as being direct and honest thus threatening face (Brown and Levinson,1987).

As a consequence of the development and use of rules, persons have expectancies regarding compliance to rules in any given context. Individuals in a system are expected to follow rules, and noncompliance may be viewed as a violation. Which environment determines the set of rules to be followed may be situational. Rules for appropriate behavior within a specific group, as suggested earlier, may be assimilated from previous knowledge of rules and then applied to the new social context. On the other hand, the context may be sufficiently different to warrant the development of idiosyncratic rules. However, these idiosyncratic rules must be based on a social understanding which is affected by other contexts.

Rules define relationships. Rules set boundaries so that members of a system can tell who is in the system and who does not belong to the system. Kantor and Lehr (1976), define the term equifinality as the notion that families are capable of achieving similar goals or ends through a variety of different ways and with different starting points. This implies that different families can have different idiosyncratic rules. Similarly, rules may differ in a classroom context by grade level. The college classroom may differ quite significantly from the high school or junior high classroom in terms of rules. Likewise, different teachers may have different approaches to the classroom context, and each student comes into the classroom with his or her own set of expectations and experiences.

Pearson (1989) holds that rules are important for three reasons. First, the development of rules reinforces relational development. Second, rule development encourages relational satisfaction. Third, rules allow individuals to define any given relationship. Rules also allow the individual to define oneself. Communication of life history allows an individual to define oneself within a system, to define one's purpose, and one's boundaries (Myerhoff, 1980). In this sense, rule negotiation allows the individual to take part in the definition of self. This may be particularly important in family and classroom contexts.

Rules and the family

In the family, children are socialized by their parents, older siblings, or other relatives with whom they come in contact. Outside of the family, persons are socialized by teachers, peers, significant others, or the media. A child's environment includes the ideology of society (e.g. formal and informal rules about how life should be conducted) (Grusec & Lytton, 1988). Children learn socially appropriate behavior by imitating others when others' behavior is not prohibited and results in positive reinforcement (Kagan, 1985). "No one is born social, but must acquire social characteristics from others and incorporate them into his [or her] own personality" (Bell, 1963).

Children learn what is acceptable behavior through the observation of the behavior of others, their own behavior, and their interaction with those others (Roedell, Slaby, & Robinson, 1977). Ford (1983) found, ". . . rules can be inferred from any repetitive family behavior." Most family rules are implicitly derived from inferences by family members about repetitive patterns of interaction in the family (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1991).

Minuchin (1974) argued that rules are dependent upon the family system. "Transactional patterns regulate family member's behavior. They are maintained by two systems of constraint. The first is generic, involving universal rules governing family organization . . . . The second

system of constraint is idiosyncratic, involving the mutual expectations of particular family members," which are derived from observations of interaction within the family (Minuchin, 1974). Indeed, family interaction follows certain persistent patterns--rules, which define the rights and duties of members (Jackson, 1965).

Members of a family may deviate from the family rules. Family rules are based on the goals and values of the family as a whole. Since values determine goals and result in the allocation of time, money, and energy, parent-adolescent differences in values might be expected to lead to conflict in the family (Nye, 1958). Conflict of goals between members of a family may motivate some members to violate the rules.

In a family context, a child who deviates from the rules may be punished by a parent or parents. The sanctions employed by a parent in this situation will depend on the ideology of that parent or the marital couple towards child-rearing. Kephart (1966) delineates between two schools of thought in regards to child-rearing: the permissive school, and the restrictive school. The permissive school holds that the needs of children to be loved, attended to, and to be afforded the right to self-expression is of more importance to the development of the child. Whereas, the restrictive school believes that teaching discipline and respect for authority is paramount in the child's development of character. The extreme application of either school may not be healthy for the development of the child. Therefore, some definition of appropriate behavior in terms of rules may be necessary for child development, as long as there also exists flexibility in the application of those rules.

Reiss (1971) theorizes that each family constructs its own idiosyncratic consensual perspective through the course of family interaction. The family develops its own pattern of interaction. In relationships, individuals interact according to expectations about the rules that

apply to the situation/relationship which are assumed to be shared by others (McLaughlin, 1984). These expectations, shared by others in the system, describe the grounds by which relational typologies can be examined.

Rules and the Classroom

As in the family context, rules are taught or negotiated in the classroom context. The mode of socialization may depend upon the age of the student. Earlier theorists posited that the individual, like a student in a classroom, is a passive recipient of instruction or socialization. However, more recently educational theorists have posited a dialectical model in which the student is "an initiator who actively influences the environment" (Staton, 1990, p. 47). Similar to the family context, the interplay between student and teacher in the negotiation of rules can lead to conflict. Indeed, the mode of socialization from top-down to collaboration may follow similar patterns in both the family and classroom contexts. The level to which a student engages in such interplay may be a function of age, as well as socially constructed factors such as gender or race/ethnicity.

LeBlanc (1992) found significant differences by gender and race/ethnicity between students regarding rules of interaction in high school classrooms. Specifically, he found that race/ethnicity and gender both influenced attitudes regarding compliance with rules in the classroom as well as the importance of those rules. In a later study, Burk and LeBlanc (1993) explored differences in attitudes between students regarding compliance with and importance of rules in the college classroom. In that study, Burk and LeBlanc (1993) also found significant differences in attitudes along gender and racial/ethnic lines. Although neither study found significant differences in attitudes according to age or status differences, it is believed that because socialization is a developmental process, age should influence perceptions about rule negotiation.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

To examine the relationships between age (and other factors) and appropriateness for rule negotiation in the family and classroom settings, we offer the following research questions:

RQ1 Is there a relationship between age or status of student and attitudes regarding rule negotiation in the classroom or family context?

RQ2 Does living with parent(s) affect attitudes regarding rule negotiation in the classroom or family context?

RQ3 Do students differ in their attitudes regarding rule negotiation according to context?

RQ4 Do students differ in their attitudes regarding when rule negotiation should begin in the classroom or family context?

To demonstrate relationships between gender or race and the appropriateness for rule negotiation in the family and classroom settings, we offer the following hypotheses:

H1 Gender will influence attitudes regarding rule negotiation in the classroom or family context.

H2 Race will influence attitudes regarding rule negotiation in the classroom or family context.

Method

To test the research questions and hypotheses, the Authority for Rule Making Survey (see Appendix) was developed.[1] The survey was administered to students (N = 107) enrolled in introductory communication courses at a large midwestern university. Independent variables included age, year in school, race/ethnicity, gender, and whether the student currently resides with

a parent(s). Rule negotiation was defined as whether the student believed he or she should participate in defining the rules for the context, or by not cooperating with rules he or she had no part in defining. Dependent variables were measured using a "Likert" type scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7).

The questionnaires were coded and analyzed using factor analysis (principle components extraction) to determine underlying dimensions for both the family and classroom contexts. The factors were tested for reliability utilizing Cronbach's alpha and were analyzed using Pearson correlation to determine if any linear relationships existed. The results of these tests are reported below.

Results

The exploratory factor analysis revealed two factors for each context (family and classroom). For the family context, Factor 1 (Family Rules Non- cooperation) accounted for 26.0% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.91, $\alpha = .73$) and included items 12, 14, 17 and 18 on the survey (see Appendix). Factor 2 (Family Rules Negotiation) accounted for 21.5% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.23, $\alpha = .85$) and included items 8, 13, 15 and 16 on the survey. For the classroom context, Factor 1 (Classroom Rules Non-cooperation) accounted for 22.6% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 3.39, $\alpha = .78$) and included items 28, 30, 33 and 34 on the survey. Factor 2 (Classroom Rules Negotiation) accounted for 17.5.% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 2.63, $\alpha = .78$) and included items 24, 29, 31 and 32 on the survey. The items for factors one and two in both contexts paralleled each other. Pearson product-moment correlation revealed significant relationships between the family and classroom context for the non-cooperation factors ($r^2 = .544$, $p < .001$) and for the negotiation factors ($r^2 = .620$, $p < .001$).

For Research Question 1, the mean age for students was 20.45 (SD = 7.47) with a minimum age of 18 and a maximum of 52. Eighty-five percent of students were below the age of twenty-five. Student status (year in school) was fairly well distributed. Of the 107 respondents, 35.5% were second year, 23.4% were third year, 18.7% were fourth year, and 22.4% were fifth year or higher. A Pearson correlation failed to find any significant relationships between age (or status) and rule negotiation in either context. A Pearson correlation also failed to find any significant relationships between age and rule non-cooperation.

For Research Question 2, 7.5% of students reported living with parents, 38.3% of student reported not living with parents, and 53.3% reported living with parents during summer and breaks. An ANOVA revealed significant differences between all three groups for rule negotiation (F (2, 106) = 4.94, p = .009) where students who reported living with parents (M = 3.98, SD = 2.00) believed more strongly that students should not negotiate rules. Students who reported living with parents only during summer and breaks believed most strongly in rule negotiation (M = 5.32, SD = 1.09), whereas students who did not live with parents where more neutral (M = 4.70, SD = 1.50). An ANOVA failed to find any significance between groups for rule non-cooperation.

For Research Question 3, paired-samples t-tests were run to compare the means for rule negotiation and non-cooperation between family and classroom contexts. Tests failed to show any significant difference between contexts for rule negotiation, with one exception. Females demonstrated different attitudes for rule negotiation in the family (M = 5.13, SD = 1.77) versus the classroom (M = 4.62, SD = 1.71) context (t = -2.49, df = 50, p = .016). However, tests demonstrated significant difference between groups of students for rule non-cooperation between family and classroom contexts (see Table 1). Race was reported as: (a) 5.6% of students were African, (b) 16.8% of students were Asian, (c) 71.0% of students were Caucasian, (d) 1.9% were

Hispanic, and (e) 4.7% reported other or missing. Given the distribution of race, non-Caucasian categories were grouped into a Minority variable and compared to the Caucasian group.

Table 1

Comparison of group means by family and classroom context for rule non-cooperation

	Family Rule Non-cooperation		Classroom Rule Non-cooperation				
	M	SD	M	SD	t	df	p
Living							
with parents	1.75	0.91	2.34	0.94	2.07	7	0.077*
not with parents	2.40	1.23	2.60	1.29	1.04	40	0.303*
during breaks only	2.53	1.17	3.04	1.23	3.36	56	0.001
Sex							
male	2.54	1.17	2.92	1.22	2.62	55	0.012
female	2.29	1.18	2.72	1.28	2.42	50	0.019
Race							
Caucasian	2.47	1.14	2.91	1.26	3.09	75	0.003
Minority	2.30	1.28	2.61	1.21	1.74	30	0.092*
All	2.42	1.18	2.82	1.25	3.56	106	0.001

Note. *These statistics are non-significant, but are supplied for comparison.

For Research Question 4, tests revealed significant differences between groups for attitudes regarding at what age children should participate in negotiation about family rules. Table 2 displays the results of oneway ANOVAs for each of the independent variables: (a) living arrangements, (b) sex of participant, and (c) race of participant. No significant differences were found between groups for attitudes regarding the age for children's participation in negotiation of classroom rules.

For Hypothesis 1, an ANOVA failed to find any significant difference by gender for rule negotiation or rule non-cooperation. However, for Hypothesis 2, an ANOVA revealed a significant difference between minority students ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.96$) and Caucasian students ($M = 5.21$, $SD = 1.18$) ($F(1, 107) = 8.93$, $p = .003$) for rule negotiation. When controlling for

Table 2

Comparison of means between groups for age of children in family rule negotiation

	N	M	SD	F	SS	df	p
Living	106	2.82	1.60	3.40	16.57	2	0.037
with parents	8	3.88	1.89				
not with parents	41	3.05	1.79				
during breaks only	57	2.51	1.32				
Sex	107	2.81	1.59	7.96	18.91	1	0.006
male	56	3.21	1.49				
female	51	2.37	1.60				
Race	107	2.81	1.59	5.26	12.81	1	0.024
Caucasian	76	2.59	1.36				
Minority	31	3.35	1.98				

Note. The scale for age of children in family rule negotiation is: (1) before 13; (2) 13-14; (3) 15-16; (4) 17-18; (5) 19-20; (6) 21 and older; and (7) never.

context, no difference was found between racial groups for family rule negotiation. However, a significant difference was found between groups for classroom rule negotiation (F (1, 107) = 12.55, p = .001). No difference was found in either context for rule non-cooperation. When all race categories were tested individually, an ANOVA revealed a significant between-groups difference for rule negotiation (F (4, 107) = 3.11, p = .018), although not for rule non-cooperation. Table 3 shows the comparison of means for each race group for the Classroom Rule Negotiation factor.

Table 3

Comparison of means between groups for classroom rule negotiation

	N	M	SD	F	SS	df	p
Race	107	4.89	1.53	4.02	33.65	4	0.005
African	6	4.00	2.14				
Asian	18	3.80	2.04				
Caucasian	76	5.21	1.18				
Hispanic	2	5.00	1.06				
Other	5	5.00	1.84				

Discussion and Conclusion

Age and sex do not appear to influence students' attitudes toward rule negotiation or non-cooperation in the classroom or the family. However, females believed more strongly in the importance of rule negotiation in the family versus rule negotiation in the classroom. Furthermore, although sex did not influence attitudes toward rule non-cooperation in either setting, sex predicted differences in attitudes between family rule non-cooperation and non-cooperation in the classroom. Both males and females believed more strongly in cooperation in the family versus the classroom. Females also believed that younger children should be allowed to negotiate rules in the family when compared to males.

Living arrangements have been demonstrated to influence attitudes toward rule negotiation. Students who lived with parents full-time believed more strongly in rule negotiation when compared to students who did not or only lived with their parents during breaks. These findings held true for both family and classroom contexts which suggests that students transfer attitudes about rule negotiation at home to the classroom environment or vice versa. Finally, living arrangements also predicted attitudes regarding the age at which children should participate in rule negotiation in the home. These findings paralleled attitudes toward rule negotiation in the home, suggesting that students who live with their parents may be more actively involved in family rule negotiation.

Race also played a role in attitudes toward rule negotiation. Although no differences were found between racial groups in their attitudes regarding rule non-cooperation in the family, differences were found in the attitudes of students toward rule negotiation in the family. Caucasians believed that younger children should be involved in rule negotiation when compared to other groups. Caucasians also believed more strongly in classroom rule negotiation than any

other group. However, Caucasians believed more strongly in family rule cooperation than classroom rule cooperation.

In general, results indicate that: (a) students differentiated between rule non-cooperation in family and classroom contexts, (b) students believed children should be allowed to negotiate rules in the family by the time they are seventeen, and (c) race played a significant role in predicting attitudes regarding rule negotiation in the classroom. These results suggest that socialization for different groups, such as gender and race, and by different living arrangements affect attitudes regarding negotiation of rules. The results also suggest that non-cooperation may not be a viable or appropriate option when rule negotiation does not occur. Attitudes seem to favor negotiation, particularly for those adults who live with their parents on a temporary basis.

This study may have given more robust findings if the sample size were larger. However, these findings should be generalizable given that student perceptions were sought from students. Future studies might examine student attitudes toward rule making authority and negotiation at differing age levels among students. Future studies might also consider examining whether there exists a connection between student attitudes and behaviors.

Rules are necessary for defining groups, setting boundaries, and providing prescriptions for behavior and interaction. Several means can be utilized for the construction of rules in groups such as families or classroom. Traditionally, rules may have been set by an individual or individuals assuming authority for setting rules for the group. In a family, these rules may be set by a/the parent(s). This act of rule setting may be necessary when the child is very young, but the strategy or tactic of top-down rule development may be less useful as the child grows older.

In the classroom setting, rules might be set by the teacher or school, through several mechanisms, including syllabi (see Danielson, 1995). Rules might also be set through covert

practices, although even indirectly setting rules from the top down may subvert the learning environment (Chouliaraki, 1996). However, the benefits of collaborative rule setting in the classroom has been recognized by teachers. According to Howard and Norris (1994), 36% of classrooms fall under the traditional paradigm, whereas 56% of classrooms utilize collaborative rule setting strategies.

Current research in communication and education suggests that the more constructive paradigm which promotes the negotiation of rules in the classroom may have more positive effects when compared to more traditional pedagogical and anthropogogical models. As Hill (1996) points out, all individuals in the classroom environment must participate to create a learning community. Indeed, the process of interaction and negotiation is a learning opportunity.

Individuals interact with each other as part of the human condition. These interactions between individuals occur within social contexts such as family systems and classroom situations. Social contexts are constructed through the development of rules which define a system's expectations regarding interactions between individuals. The social context of the family system has its own idiosyncratic rules of interaction which are learned by members of the family. Any given family will develop rules, or patterns of behavior, which can be observed by family members (or researchers). Classrooms, like families, also develop idiosyncratic rules. It is the development of those rules of interaction, in both contexts, which become negotiation as the child matures into adulthood. And, the development of these rules can be observed.

References

Bell, R. R. (1963). Marriage and family interaction. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Berger, C. R., & Kellerman, K. (in press). Acquiring social information. In J. Daly & J. M. Wiemann (Eds.), Communicating strategically. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Bruner, J. S., & Sherwood, V. (1976). Peekaboo and the learning of rule structures. In J. S. Bruner, A. Jolly, & K. Sylva (Eds.), Play: Its role in evolution and development. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Burk, J., & LeBlanc, H. P., III. (1993, November). Implicit nonverbal rules in the classroom: A study of gender and status differences. Paper presented at the seventy-ninth annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Burgoon, J. K., & Saine, T. (1978). The unspoken dialogue. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Chouliaraki, L. (1996). Regulative practices in a "progressivist" classroom: "Good habits" as a "disciplinary technology." Language and Education, 10, 103-118.

Danielson, M. A. (1995, April). The role of course syllabi in classroom socialization. Paper presented at the sixty-third annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Ford, F. R. (1983). Rules: The visible family. Family Process, 22, 135-145.

Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (1991). Family therapy: An overview (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks Cole.

Grusec, J. E., & Lytton, H. (1988). Social development: History, theory, and research. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Halberstadt, A. G. (1986). Family socialization of emotional expression and nonverbal communicator styles and skills. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 827-836.

Hill, M. S. (1996). Making students part of the safe schools solution. NASSP Bulletin, 80(579), 24-30.

Howard, N. A., & Norris, M. R. (1994). Source, characteristics, and perceived effectiveness of classroom rules. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 855).

Jackson, D. D. (1965). Family rules: Marital quid pro quo. Archives of General Psychiatry, 12, 589-594.

Jones, W. T. (1975). A history of western philosophy IV: Kant and the nineteenth century (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Kagan, J. (1958). The concept of identification. In G. C. Thompson (Ed.), Social development and personality (pp. 259-266). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. (1976). Inside the family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kephart, W. M. (1966). The family, society, and the individual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

LeBlanc, H. P., III. (1997). Student perceptions of rules for classroom interaction. (Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Ruoge, 1992). Parkland, FL: Dissertation.com.

Littlejohn, S. W. (1989). Theories of human communication. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McCoy, M., & Zigler, E. (1965). Social reinforcer effectiveness as a function of the relationship between child and adult. In G. C. Thompson (Ed.), Social development and personality (pp. 75-85). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

McLaughlin, M. L. (1984). Conversation: How talk is organized. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Mowrer, O. H. (1960). Learning theory and behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Myerhoff, B. (1980). Telling one's story. The Center Magazine, March, 22.

Nye, F. I. (1958). Family relationships and delinquent behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Pearson, J. C. (1989). Communication in the family: Seeking satisfaction in changing times. New York: Harper and Row.

Reiss, D. (1971). Varieties of consensual experience. Family Process, 10, 1-24.

Roedell, W. C., Slaby, R. G., & Robinson, H. B. (1977). Social development in young children. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Shimanoff, S. B. (1980). Communication rules: Theory and research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Smith, M. J. (1982). Persuasion and human action: A review and critique of social influence theories. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Staats, A. W., & Staats, C. K. (1958). Attitudes established by classical conditioning. In R. K. Parker (Ed.), Readings in educational psychology (pp. 203-211). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Staton, A. Q. (1990). An ecological perspective on college/university teaching. In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti, (Eds.), Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods (pp. 39-52). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Footnote

[1] The Authority for Rule Making Survey (ARMS) was part of a larger survey regarding compliance resistance strategies that covered several contexts. The ARMS sections on the family and classroom contexts were separated by other sections and therefore were not sequentially placed.

APPENDIX

Authority for Rule Making Survey

A. What is your current age? (Please fill out the "Birth Date" section of the NCS Answer Sheet).

Please answer the following questions by number on the NCS Answer Sheet:

1. What year are you in school?
   (A) 1st (B) 2nd (C) 3rd (D) 4th (E) 5th or more

2. What level are you in school?
   (A) Freshman (B) Sophomore (C) Junior (D) Senior (E) Graduate (F) Other

3. What is your sex? (A) Male (B) Female

4. What is your race/ethnicity?
   (A) African (B) Asian (C) Caucasian (D) Hispanic (E) Other

5. Do you live with your parents (please circle one)?
   (A) Yes (B) No (C) Occassionally

Please answer these questions in reference to your relationship with your parent(s) at your current age, according to the following scale.

1 (Strongly Disagree) 2 (Disgree) 3 (Somewhat Disagree) 4 (Unsure) 5 (Somewhat Agree) 6 (Agree) 7 (Strongly Agree)

6. Parents should make the rules regarding childrens' behavior in the family household.

7. Children should make the rules regarding childrens' behavior in the family household.

8. Parents and children together should construct rules regarding childrens' behavior in the family household.

9. There should be **NO** rules for childrens' behavior in the family household.

10. Children should follow all rules made by their parent(s).

11. Children should follow rules they did not help make.

12. Children should follow only the rules with which they agree.

13. Children should directly state their opinions about rules, made by their parent(s), with which they disagree.

14. Children should **NOT** follow the rules with which they disagree in a subtle and indirect manner.

15. Children should ask their parent(s) for reasons why they should follow rules with which they disagree.

16. Children should explain why they disagree with a rule (such as teacher's or peers' attitudes).

17. Children should **NOT** follow the rules with which they disagree in an obvious manner.

18. Children should state that they are not responsible for rules they did not make.

19. Children should act nice toward their parent(s) even though they do not intend to follow rules with which they disagree.

20. Rules in the family household should be different depending on the age of the child.

21. Please circle the age of children at which rules should begin to be negotiated between children and their parents:
   (A) Before 13 (B) 13 - 14 (C) 15 - 16 (D) 17 - 18
   (E) 19 - 20 (F) 21 and older (G) NEVER

Please answer these questions in reference to your relationship with your teacher(s).

22. Teachers should make the rules regarding students' behavior in the classroom.

23. Students should make the rules regarding students' behavior in the classroom.

24. Students and teachers together should construct rules regarding students' behavior in the classroom.

25. There should be **NO** rules for students' behavior in the classroom.

26. Students should follow all rules made by the teacher.

27. Students should follow rules they did not help make.

28. Students should follow only the rules with which they agree.

29. Students should directly state their opinions about rules, made by the teacher, with which they disagree.

30. Students should **NOT** follow the rules, with which they disagree, in a subtle and indirect manner.

31. Students should ask the teacher for reasons why they should follow rules with which they disagree.

32. Students should explain why they disagree with a rule (such as parents' or peers' attitudes).

33. Students should **NOT** follow the rules with which they disagree in an obvious manner.

34. Students should state that they are not responsible for rules they did not make.

35. Students should act nice toward the teacher even though they do not intend to follow rules with which they disagree.

36. Rules in the high school and college classroom should be different.

37. Please circle the age of students at which rules should begin to be negotiated between students and the teacher:
(A) Before 13 (B) 13 - 14 (C) 15 - 16 (D) 17 - 18
(E) 19 - 20 (F) 21 and older (G) NEVER